



FACSIMILE

DATE: August 05, 2004
OFFICIAL PAPER

Please deliver this and the following pages to:

Examiner: **Pierre E. Elisca**
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit: **3621**
Telecopier No.: **(703) 872-9306**
U.S. Serial No.: **09/909,673**
Client/Matter No.: **MSFT-0314**
Sender's Name: **Peter M. Ullman**
Pages to Follow: **1**

If transmission is not complete, please call our Philadelphia Office at (215) 568-3100.

COVER MESSAGE:

OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.

Attached hereto is/are the following documents:

- 1) Proposed interview agenda

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
woodcock.com

PAGE 1/2 * RCVD AT 8/5/2004 4:17:21 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFAXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:+2155683439 * DURATION (mm-ss):00:46

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG - 5 2004

OFFICIAL

PHILADELPHIA

One Liberty Place, 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-568-3100
Fax: 215-568-3439

SEATTLE

999 Third Avenue, Suite 1606
Seattle, WA 98104
206-332-1380
Fax: 206-624-7317

JOB CODE: 06286

Proposed agenda for interview in 09/909,673

1. Claims 1, 14, 15, 20, 28, and 38: The applied prior art does not teach licensing a digital work *in accordance with the terms specified in another license*. The examiner has treated the applicants' argument as if it asserted that the distinguishing feature were either "licensing of a digital work" or "licensing of content in accordance with terms." Applicants would like to discuss how the italicized language differs from the examiner's response to the argument.
2. Claims 4, 5, 18, 22, 23, 32, 44, and 45: The applied prior art does not teach that payment is a condition for licensing content. There is a difference between: (a) issuing a license that requires payment as a condition for use, and (b) issuing a license, or not issuing a license, depending on whether there is a payment.
3. Claims 6, 19, 24, 33, and 46: The applied prior art does not teach revoking a license or making a license unusable as a condition for issuing another license.
4. Claim 8: The examiner has not addressed applicant's argument that the applied prior art teaches that rights and content always travel together. Applicant would like to discuss how claim 8 differs from the prior art in this regard.
5. Claim 37: The examiner has not addressed applicant's argument that the applied prior art does not teach a system where content is licensed on a first and second device, but at no computer further down the chain. Applicants would like to discuss how claim 37 differs from the prior art in this regard.